arXiv:1305.1266v2 [math.AP] 15 May 2013

Global existence and blow-up of solutions to some quasilinear wave equation in one space dimension

YUUSUKE SUGIYAMA*

Abstract

We consider the global existence and blow up of solutions of the Cauchy problem of the quasilinear wave equation: $\partial_t^2 u = \partial_x(c(u)^2\partial_x u)$, which has richly physical backgrounds. Under the assumption that $c(u(0,x)) \geq \delta$ for some $\delta > 0$, we give sufficient conditions for the existence of global smooth solutions and the occurrence of two types of blow-up respectively. One of the two types is that L^∞-norm of $\partial_t u$ or $\partial_x u$ goes up to the infinity. The other type is that $c(u)$ vanishes, that is, the equation degenerates.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider the Cauchy problem of the following wave equation:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^2 u = \partial_x(c(u)^2\partial_x u), & (t,x) \in (0,T] \times \mathbb{R}, \\ u(0,x) = u_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ \partial_t u(0,x) = u_1(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $u(t,x)$ is an unknown real valued function. The equation in (1.1) has some physical backgrounds including vibrations of a string.

We assume that $c \in C^\infty((\theta_0,\infty))$ for some $\theta_0 \in [-\infty, 0)$ satisfies that

$$\lim_{\theta \searrow \theta_0} c(\theta) = 0, \tag{1.2}$$

$$c(\theta) > 0 \ \text{ for all } \theta > \theta_0, \tag{1.3}$$

$$c'(\theta) \geq 0 \ \text{ for } \ \theta > \theta_0. \tag{1.4}$$

We denote Sobolev space $(1-\partial_x^2)^{-\frac{s}{2}}L^2(\mathbb{R})$ for $s \in \mathbb{R}$ by $H^s(\mathbb{R})$. For a Banach space X, $C^j([0,T];X)$ denotes the set of functions $f : [0,T] \to X$ such that $f(t)$ and its k times derivatives for $k = 1,2,\dots,j$ are continuous. $L^\infty([0,T];X)$ denotes the set of functions $f : [0,T] \to X$ such that the norm $\|f\|_{L^\infty([0,T];X)} := \operatorname{ess.sup}_{[0,T]} \|f(t)\|_X$ is finite. Various positive constants are simply denoted by C.

By dividing the both side of (1.1) by $c(u(t,x))^2$, (1.1) is formed to

$$\frac{1}{c(u(t,x))^2}\partial_t^2 u(t,x) - \partial_x^2 u(t,x) = \frac{2c'(u(t,x))(\partial_x u(t,x))^2}{c(u(t,x))}. \tag{1.5}$$

---

*sugiyama@ma.kagu.tus.ac.jp, Department of Mathematics, Tokyo University of Science

Since the left hand side of (1.5) has a singularity at $u = \theta_0$, we call a solution u to hyperbolic equation (1.1) to blow up, when

$$\overline{\lim_{t \nearrow T}} (\|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^\infty} + \|\partial_x u(t)\|_{L^\infty}) = \infty, \tag{1.6}$$

or

$$\lim_{t \nearrow T} \inf_{(s,x) \in [0,t] \times \mathbb{R}} u(s, x) = \theta_0, \tag{1.7}$$

occurs in finite time $T > 0$ under the assumption that $u(0, x) \geq \delta$ for some positive constant δ. The blow up criterion (1.6) and (1.7) of some class of hyperbolic systems including (1.1) is introduced in the textbooks of Majda [15] and Alinhac [2]. The aim of this paper is to obtain sufficient conditions for the global existence of solutions and the occurrence of the blow-up phenomena (1.6) and (1.7) in finite time respectively.

We denote the blow up time of the solution u of the Cauchy problem (1.1) by T^*, that is,

$$T^* := \sup\{\ T > 0 \mid \sup_{[0,T]} \{\|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^\infty} + \|\partial_x u(t)\|_{L^\infty}\} < \infty, \ \inf_{[0,T] \times \mathbb{R}} u(t, x) > \theta_0\ \}.$$

Theorem 1. *Let* $c(\cdot) \in C^\infty((\theta_0, \infty))$ *and initial data* $(u_0, u_1) \in H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}) \times H^s(\mathbb{R})$ *for* $s > \frac{1}{2}$. *Suppose* $c(\theta)$ *and* (u_0, u_1) *satisfy* (1.2), (1.3), (1.4) *and*

$$u_0(x) > \theta_0 \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{1.8}$$

$$u_1(x) \pm c(u_0(x)) \partial_x u_0(x) \leq 0 \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{1.9}$$

$$-\int_{\mathbb{R}} u_1(x) dx < \int_{\theta_0}^{0} c(\theta) d\theta. \tag{1.10}$$

Then (1.1) *has a unique global solution such that* $u \in \bigcap_{j=0,1,2} C^j([0, \infty); H^{s-j+1}(\mathbb{R}))$.

Theorem 2. *Let* $\theta_0 \neq -\infty$. *Under the same assumption as in Theorem* 1 *without* (1.10), *we assume that*

$$\operatorname{supp} u_0,\ \operatorname{supp} u_1 \subset [-K, K] \quad \text{for some } K > 0, \tag{1.11}$$

$$-\int_{\mathbb{R}} u_1(x) dx > -2\theta_0 c(0). \tag{1.12}$$

Then $T^* < \infty$ *and the solution* $u \in \bigcap_{j=0,1,2} C^j([0, T^*); H^{s-j+1}(\mathbb{R}))$ *of* (1.1) *satisfies that*

$$\lim_{t \nearrow T^*} u(t, x_0) = \theta_0 \quad \text{for some } x_0 \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Theorem 3. *Let* $c \in C^\infty((\theta_0, \infty))$ *and initial data* $(u_0, u_1) \in H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}) \times H^s(\mathbb{R}) \setminus \{0\}$ *for* $s > \frac{1}{2}$. *Suppose* $c(\theta)$ *and* (u_0, u_1) *satisfy that there exists a constant* $\delta > 0$ *such that*

$$u_0(x) > \theta_0 \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{1.13}$$

$$c'(\theta) > 0 \quad \text{for all } \theta > \theta_0, \tag{1.14}$$

$$\operatorname{supp} u_0,\ \operatorname{supp} u_1 \subset [-K, K] \quad \text{for some } K > 0, \tag{1.15}$$

$$u_1(x) \pm c(u_0(x)) \partial_x u_0(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{1.16}$$

Then $T^* < \infty$ *and the solution* $u \in \bigcap_{j=0,1,2} C^j([0, T^*); H^{s-j+1}(\mathbb{R}))$ *of* (1.1) *satisfies*

$$\overline{\lim_{t \nearrow T^*}} \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^\infty} + \|\partial_x u(t)\|_{L^\infty} = \infty.$$

Remark 4. Let $c(\cdot) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and initial data $(u_0, u_1) \in H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}) \times H^s(\mathbb{R}) \setminus \{0\}$ for $s > \frac{1}{2}$. Suppose that there exists a constant $c_1 > 0$ such that $c(\theta) \geq c_1$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ instead of the assumption (1.2) and (1.3). If (1.4) and (1.9) hold, then (1.1) has a unique global solution such that $u \in \bigcap_{j=0,1,2} C^j([0,\infty); H^{s-j+1}(\mathbb{R}))$.

Remark 5. In Theorem 1, if $\theta = -\infty$, then we does not need the assumption (1.10).

Remark 6. The equation in (1.1) does not degenerate for the global solution which is constructed by Theorem 1, that is, the global solution u in Theorem 1 satisfies that there exists a constant $\theta_1 > \theta_0$ such that

$$u(t,x) \geq \theta_1,$$

for $(t,x) \in [0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$.

The equation in (1.1) has richly physical backgrounds (e.g. the flow of a one dimensional gas, the shallow water waves, the longitudinal wave propagation on a moving threadline, the dynamics of a finite nonlinear string, the elastic-plastic materials or the electromagnetic transmission line). In [2], Ames, Lohner and Adams study the group properties of the equation in (1.1) by using the Lie algebra and introduce physical backgrounds. In [20], Zabusky introduce the equation

$$\partial_t^2 v = (1 + \partial_x v)^a \partial_x^2 v, \tag{1.17}$$

which describes the standing vibrations of a finite, continuous and nonlinear string for $a > 0$. Setting $u = \partial_x v$ for the solution v to (1.17), u is a solution to the equation:

$$\partial_t^2 u = \partial_x((1+u)^a \partial_x u). \tag{1.18}$$

In author's previous work [11], the author show a global existence theorem for (1.1) under some conditions on the function c and initial data. However, we can not apply the global existence theorem of [11] to (1.18) since the theorem requires the condition that there exists a constant $c_0 > 0$ such that

$$c(\theta) \geq c_0 \quad \text{for all } \theta \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{1.19}$$

Our global existence theorem (Theorem 1) can yield a global solvability for some equations including (1.18).

Many authors [5, 6, 18, 19, 8, 9, 11] study the Cauchy problem of the equation

$$\partial_t^2 u = c(u)^2 \partial_x^2 u + \lambda c(u) c'(u) (\partial_x u)^2, \tag{1.20}$$

for $0 \leq \lambda \leq 2$. (1.20) with $\lambda = 2$ is the equation in (1.1).

Kato and Sugiyama [9] and Sugiyama [9] show that the same theorem as Theorem 2 holds for (1.20) for $0 \leq \lambda < 2$ without the restriction $\int_{\mathbb{R}} u_1(x)dx$ (the assumption (1.12)).

The equation in (1.1) is related to equations

$$\partial_t v = \pm c(v) \partial_x v \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_t^2 v = c(\partial_x v) \partial_x^2 v. \tag{1.21}$$

In fact, the solution v to the first equation of (1.21) is a solution to the equation in (1.1). The function $\partial_x v$ with the solution v to the second equation of (1.21) is a solution to the equation in (1.1). Lax [10] and John [3] study the blow up for the first and the second equations of (1.21) respectively. In [16], MacCamy and Mizel study the Dirichlet problem for the second equation in (1.21).

The blow up of the 2 and 3 dimensional versions of the equation in (1.1):

$$\partial_t^2 u = \operatorname{div}(c(u)^2 \nabla u),$$

is studied by Li, Witt and Yin [14] and Ding and Yin [4] respectively.

We prove Theorem 1 by using Zhang and Zheng's idea in [18] and an estimate which ensure that the equation does not degenerate. In [18], Zhang and Zheng show the global existence of solution to (1.20) with $\lambda = 1$ under some conditions on c and initial data including (1.19).

The proof of Theorem 2 is based on the method in [9, 11] which give a sufficient condition that the equation (1.20) for $0 \leq \lambda < 2$ and $c(u) = u + 1$ degenerates in finite time.

In the proof of Theorem 3, we use the Riemann invariants and the method of characteristic.

This paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we introduce the local existence and the uniqueness of solutions of (1.1). In Sections 3, 4 and 5, we show Theorems 1, 2 and 3 respectively.

2 Local existence and uniqueness

In this section, we introduce the local existence and the uniqueness of solutions of (1.1). The local well-posedness of some class of second order quasilinear strictly hyperbolic equations including the equation (1.1) is established by Hughes, Kato and Marsden [7]. Their proofs are based on the Energy method. Furthermore, by the Moser type inequality, the above local well-posedness results are sharpened (e.g. Majda [15] and Taylor [17]). Roughly speaking, the results in [15] and [17] state that the solution u of (1.1) persists as long as $\|\partial_t u\|_{L^\infty}$ and $\|\partial_x u\|_{L^\infty}$ are bounded.

The following theorem is obtained by applying Theorem 2.2 in [15] and Proposition 5.3.B in [17] to the Cauchy problem (1.1).

Proposition 7. *Suppose that $c(\theta)$ and $(u_0, u_1) \in H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}) \times H^s(\mathbb{R})$ for $s > \frac{1}{2}$ and $c \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ satisfy* (1.8)*. Then there exist $T > 0$ and a unique solution u of* (1.1) *with*

$$u \in \bigcap_{j=0,1,2} C^j([0,\infty); H^{s-j+1}(\mathbb{R})) \tag{2.1}$$

and

$$u(t,x) > \theta_0 \quad \text{for } (t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}. \tag{2.2}$$

Furthermore, if (1.1) *does not have a global solution u satisfying* (2.1) *and* (2.2)*, then the solution u satisfies*

$$\varlimsup_{t \nearrow T} \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^\infty} + \|\partial_x u(t)\|_{L^\infty} = \infty. \tag{2.3}$$

or

$$\lim_{t \nearrow T} \inf_{(s,y)\in[0,t)\times\mathbb{R}} u(s,y) = \theta_0, \tag{2.4}$$

for some $T > 0$.

3 Proof of Theorem 1

We set the Riemann invariants $R_1(t,x)$ and $R_2(t,x)$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 &= \partial_t u + c(u)\partial_x u, \\ R_2 &= \partial_t u - c(u)\partial_x u. \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

By (1.1), R_1 and R_2 are solutions to the system of the following first oder equations

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t R_1 - c(u)\partial_x R_1 = \dfrac{c'(u)}{2c(u)}(R_1^2 - R_2R_1), \\ \partial_t u = \dfrac{1}{2}(R_1 + R_2), \\ \partial_t R_2 + c(u)\partial_x R_2 = \dfrac{c'(u)}{2c(u)}(R_2^2 - R_1R_2). \end{cases} \tag{3.2}$$

For the proof of Theorem 1, we prove some lemma.

Lemma 8. *Suppose that* $c(\theta) \in C^\infty((\theta_0,\infty))$ *and initial data* $(u_0,u_1) \in H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}) \times H^s(\mathbb{R})$ *with* $s > \dfrac{1}{2}$ *satisfy* (1.8) *and that* R_1 *and* R_2 *are the functions in* (3.1) *for the solution* u *of* (1.1) *such that* $u \in \bigcap_{j=0,1,2} C^j([0,T^*); H^{s-j+1}(\mathbb{R}))$.

If $R_1(0,x) \geq 0$ *for all* x, *then* $R_1(t,x) \geq 0$ *for all* $(t,x) \in [0,T^*) \times \mathbb{R}$.
If $R_1(0,x) \leq 0$ *for all* x, *then* $R_1(t,x) \leq 0$ *for all* $(t,x) \in [0,T^*) \times \mathbb{R}$.
If $R_2(0,x) \geq 0$ *for all* x, *then* $R_2(t,x) \geq 0$ *for all* $(t,x) \in [0,T^*) \times \mathbb{R}$.
If $R_2(0,x) \leq 0$ *for all* x, *then* $R_2(t,x) \leq 0$ *for all* $(t,x) \in [0,T^*) \times \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. We show that $R_1(t,\cdot) \geq 0$ with $R_1(0,0) \geq 0$ only.

For any point $(t_0,x_0) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}$, let $x_\pm(t)$ denote the plus and minus characteristic curves on the first and third equations of (3.2) through (t_0,x_0) respectively as follows,

$$\frac{dx_\pm(t)}{dt} = \pm u(t, x_\pm(t)), \qquad x_\pm(t_0) = x_0. \tag{3.3}$$

From (3.2), $R_1(t,x_-(t))$ is a solution to

$$\frac{d}{dt}R_1(t,x_-(t)) = \frac{c'(u)}{2c(u)}(R_1(t,x_-(t))^2 - R_2(t,x_-(t))R_1(t,x_-(t))). \tag{3.4}$$

By the uniqueness of the differential equation (3.4), we have $R_1(t,x_-(t)) = 0$ for $t \in [0,T^*)$ with $R_1(0,x_-(0)) = 0$, which implies that $R_1(t,\cdot) \geq 0$ with $R_1(0,\cdot) \geq 0$.

□

Lemma 9. *Let* $p \in [1, \infty)$. *Suppose that* $c(\theta) \in C^\infty((\theta_0, \infty))$ *and initial data* $(u_0, u_1) \in H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}) \times H^s(\mathbb{R})$ *with* $s > \dfrac{1}{2}$ *satisfy* (1.4), (1.8) *and* (1.9). *Then we have*

$$\|R_1(t)\|_{L^p}^p + \|R_2(t)\|_{L^p}^p \leq \|R_1(0)\|_{L^p}^p + \|R_2(0)\|_{L^p}^p, \ \text{for } t \in [0, T^*), \tag{3.5}$$

where R_1 *and* R_2 *are the functions in* (3.1) *for the solution* u *of* (1.1) *such that* $u \in \bigcap_{j=0,1,2} C^j([0, T^*); H^{s-j+1}(\mathbb{R}))$.

Proof. The proof is almost the same as in the proof of Lemma 5 in Zhang and Zheng's paper [18]. We give the proof of this lemma for reader's convenience.

We denote $\tilde{R_1} := -R_1$ and $\tilde{R_2} := -R_2$. Lemma 8 implies that $\tilde{R_1}(t) \geq 0$ and $\tilde{R_2}(t) \geq 0$ for all t. By the first equation of (3.2), we have

$$\partial_t \tilde{R_1} - c(u)\partial_x \tilde{R_1} = -\frac{c'(u)}{2c(u)}(\tilde{R_1}^2 - \tilde{R_2}\tilde{R_1}).$$

Multiplying the both side of the above equation by $(\tilde{R_1})^{p-1}$, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{p}\{\partial_t(\tilde{R_1})^p - c\partial_x(\tilde{R_1})^p\} = -\frac{c'}{2c}((\tilde{R_1})^{p+1} - \tilde{R_2}(\tilde{R_1})^p), \tag{3.6}$$

By the third equation of (3.2), we have

$$\frac{1}{p}c\partial_x(\tilde{R_1})^p = \frac{1}{p}\partial_x(c(\tilde{R_1})^p) + \frac{1}{p}\frac{c'}{2c}(\tilde{R_1} - \tilde{R_2}), \tag{3.7}$$

from which, (3.6) yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{p}\{\partial_t(\tilde{R_1})^p - \partial_x(c(\tilde{R_1})^p)\} = &-(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2p})\frac{c'}{c}(\tilde{R_1})^{p+1} \\ &+ \frac{c}{2c'}\tilde{R_2}(\tilde{R_1})^p - \frac{c'}{2pc}\tilde{R_2}(\tilde{R_1})^p. \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

By the similar computation as above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{p}\{\partial_t(\tilde{R_2})^p - \partial_x(c(\tilde{R_2})^p)\} = &-(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2p})\frac{c'}{c}(\tilde{R_2})^{p+1} \\ &+ \frac{c'}{2c}\tilde{R_1}(\tilde{R_2})^p - \frac{c'}{2pc}\tilde{R_1}(\tilde{R_2})^p. \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

By summing up (3.8) and (3.9) and integration over $\mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{p}\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathbb{R}_1}(\tilde{R_1})^p + (\tilde{R_2})^p dx = &-(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2p})\int_{\mathbb{R}_1}\frac{c'}{c}((\tilde{R_1})^{p+1} - \tilde{R_1}(\tilde{R_2})^p)dx \\ &-(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2p})\int_{\mathbb{R}}\frac{c'}{c}((\tilde{R_2})^{p+1} - \tilde{R_2}(\tilde{R_1})^p)dx \\ = &-(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2p})\int_{\mathbb{R}}\frac{c'}{c}(\tilde{R_1} - \tilde{R_2})((\tilde{R_1})^p - (\tilde{R_2})^p)dx \leq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Therefore, integrating the both side of (3.10) over $[0, t]$, we have (3.5). ☐

Lemma 10. *Under the same assumption as in Lemma 9, we have*

$$\|R_1(t)\|_{L^\infty} + \|R_2(t)\|_{L^\infty} \le 2(\|R_1(0)\|_{L^\infty} + \|R_2(0)\|_{L^\infty}), \ \ \textit{for } t \in [0, T^*). \tag{3.11}$$

Proof. Noting inequalities $a^p + b^p \le (a+b)^p$ and $(a+b)^p \le 2^p(a+b)^p$ for $a, b \ge 0$, by raising the both side of (3.5) to the $\dfrac{1}{p}$ power, we have

$$\|R_1(t)\|_{L^p} + \|R_2(t)\|_{L^p} \le 2(\|R_1(0)\|_{L^p} + \|R_2(0)\|_{L^p}).$$

From the fact that $\lim_{p\to\infty} \|u\|_{L^p} = \|u\|_{L^\infty}$ with $u \in H^s(\mathbb{R})$ $(s > 1/2)$ (e.g. Lemma 11 in [11]), we have (3.11).

□

Lemma 11. *Suppose that* $c(\theta) \in C^\infty((\theta_0, \infty))$ *and initial data* $(u_0, u_1) \in H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}) \times H^s(\mathbb{R})$ *with* $s > \dfrac{1}{2}$ *satisfy* (1.4), (1.8), (1.9) *and* (1.10). *Then there exists* $\theta_1 > \theta_0$ *such that*

$$u(t,x) \ge \theta_1, \quad \textit{for } (t,x) \in [0, T^*) \times \mathbb{R}, \tag{3.12}$$

where R_1 *and* R_2 *are the functions which defined in* (3.1) *for the solution* u *of* (1.1) *such that* $u \in \bigcap_{j=0,1,2} C^j([0,T^*); H^{s-j+1}(\mathbb{R}))$.

Proof. From Lemma 8, we have

$$|c(u)\partial_x u(t,x)| \le -\partial_t u(t,x), \tag{3.13}$$

from which, a simple computation yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_0^{u(t,x)} c(\theta) d\theta \right| &= \left| \int_{-\infty}^x c(u)\partial_x u(t,y) dy \right| \\ &\le \int_{\mathbb{R}} |c(u)\partial_x u(t,y)| dy \\ &\le - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \partial_t u(t,y) dy. \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

While, by the equation in (1.1), we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \partial_t u(t,y) dy = 0. \tag{3.15}$$

By (1.10), (3.14) and (3.15) we have

$$\left| \int_0^{u(t,x)} c(\theta) d\theta \right| \le - \int_{\mathbb{R}} u_1(x) dx < \int_{\theta_0}^0 c(\theta) d\theta. \tag{3.16}$$

From (3.16), (1.2) and (1.3), we have (3.12). □

Proof of Theorem 1

From Lemma 11, (2.4) does not occur.

The estimates (3.11) and (3.12) yield the uniform boundedness of $\|\partial_x u\|_{L^\infty}$ and $\|\partial_t u\|_{L^\infty}$ with $t \in [0, T^*)$. So (2.3) does not occur.

Therefore, we complete the proof of Theorem 1.

$\square$

Proof of Remark 5

Suppose $T^* < \infty$.

By a simple computation, we have

$$\|u(t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|u_0\|_{L^\infty} + T^* \sup_{[0,T^*)} \{\|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^\infty}\}.$$

By Lemma 11, we obtain the boundedness of $\|u(t)\|_{L^\infty}$, $\|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^\infty}$ and $\|\partial_x u(t)\|_{L^\infty}$ for $t, \in [0, T^*)$, which implies that the blow up (2.3) and (2.4) does not occur, which is contradiction to $T^* < \infty$.

$\square$

4 Proof of Theorem 2

First, we proof $T^* < \infty$. For this purpose, we use the following lemma.

Lemma 12. *Suppose that* $c(\theta) \in C^\infty((\theta_0, \infty))$ *and initial data* $(u_0, u_1) \in H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}) \times H^s(\mathbb{R})$ *with* $s > \dfrac{1}{2}$ *satisfy* (1.8) *and* (1.11). *Then the solution* $u \in \bigcap_{j=0,1,2} C^j([0, T^*); H^{s-j+1}(\mathbb{R}))$ *satisfies that*

$$\operatorname{supp} u(t,x) \subset [-c(0)t - K, c(0)t + K],$$

where $K > 0$ *is a constant in* (1.11).

Lemma 12 is proved in many text book (e.g. p. 16 in Sogge's book [12]). Sogge Prove the same assertion as in Lemma 12 for the C^2 solution u. By the standard approximation argument, Lemma 12 can be proved in the same way as in the proof in [12].

Set $F(t) = -\int_{\mathbb{R}} u(t,x)dx$ for $0 \leq t < T^*$.

By the equation in (1.1), we have

$$\frac{d^2 F}{dt^2}(t) = 0,$$

which implies that

$$F(t) = F(0) + tF'(0). \tag{4.1}$$

By Lemma 8 and the fact that $u(t, \cdot) > \theta_0$ for $t \in [0, T^*)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F(t) &= -\int_{-c(0)t-K}^{c(0)t+K} u(t,x)dx \\ &\leq -\int_{-c(0)t-K}^{c(0)t+K} \theta_0 dx \\ &= -2\theta_0(c(0)t + K). \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

From (4.1) and (4.2), we obtain that

$$\frac{F(0)+2\theta_0 c(0)}{\int_{\mathbb{R}} u_1(x)dx - 2\theta_0 c(0)} \geq t.$$

We note that the left hand side of the above inequality is finite by (1.12).

Since t can be chosen for all $[0,T^*)$, we have $T^* \leq \dfrac{F(0)+2\theta_0 c(0)}{\int_{\mathbb{R}} u_1(x)dx - 2\theta_0 c(0)} < \infty$.

Next, we show that

$$\lim_{t\nearrow T^*} \inf_{(s,y)\in[0,t)\times\mathbb{R}} u(s,y) = \theta_0. \tag{4.3}$$

Suppose that (4.3) does not occur. So there exists a constant $\delta > 0$ such that

$$c(u(t,x)) \geq \delta,$$

for all all $(t,x) \in [0,T^*) \times \mathbb{R}$.

By Lemma 11, we have the boundedness of $\|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^\infty}$ and $\|\partial_x u(t)\|_{L^\infty}$ on $[0,T^*]$, which is contradiction to the fact that $T^* < \infty$. Hence we have (4.3).

Finally, we show that

$$\lim_{t\nearrow T^*} u(t,x_0) = \theta_0 \quad \text{for some } x_0 \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{4.4}$$

Since $u(t,x)$ is a monotone decreasing function of t for fixed x, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t\nearrow T^*} \inf_{(s,y)\in[0,t)\times\mathbb{R}} u(s,y) &= \lim_{t\nearrow T^*} \inf_{x\in\mathbb{R}} u(t,x) \\ &= \inf_{x\in\mathbb{R}} \lim_{t\nearrow T^*} u(t,x). \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

The right hand side of (4.5) is equivalent to (4.4) since $\lim_{t\nearrow T^*} u(t,x)$ is compactly supported.

□

Remark 13. The same theorem as Theorem 2 holds for the equation (1.20) for $0 \leq \lambda \leq 2$.

5 Proof of Theorem 3

We define functions R_1, R_2 and characteristic lines $x_\pm$ as (3.1) and (3.3) respectively.

By $u_1(x) \not\equiv 0$, we have $R_1(0,\cdot) \not\equiv 0$ or $R_2(0,\cdot) \not\equiv 0$. We assume that $R_1(0,x_0) \neq 0$.

Suppose that $T^* = \infty$.

From

$$\frac{d}{dt} u(t,x_-(t)) = R_2(t,x_-(t)), \tag{5.1}$$

and the assumption $R_2(0,x) \geq 0$, Lemma 8 yields that $u(t,x_-(t))$ is a monotone increasing function with t. By (1.4), there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that

$$c(u(t,x_-(t))) \geq \delta. \tag{5.2}$$

In the same way as in the proof of Lemma 8, we obtain

$$R_2(t, x_+(t)) = 0 \quad \text{for } t \geq 0,$$

with $x_+(0) \notin \operatorname{supp} R_2(0, \cdot)$.

Since $R_2(0, \cdot)$ is compactly supported, there exists $T_0 > 0$ such that

$$R_2(t, x_-(t)) = 0 \quad \text{for } t \geq T_0. \tag{5.3}$$

By (5.1) and (5.3), we have

$$u(0, x_-(0)) \leq u(t, x_-(t)) \leq C, \tag{5.4}$$

for some constant $C > 0$.

By (1.14), (5.2) and (5.4), we obtain

$$\delta \leq c(u(t, x_-(t))) \leq C_1 \quad \text{and} \quad C_2 \leq c'(u(t, x_-(t))) \leq C_3 \tag{5.5}$$

for some constant $C_j > 0$ for $j = 1,\ 2$ and 3.

We chose $x_-(0)$ such that $R_1(0, x_-(0)) > 0$.

Noting that $R_1(t, x_-(t)) > 0$ for $t \geq 0$, by (5.3) and (5.4), $R_1(t, x_-(t))$ satisfies that

$$\frac{d}{dt} R_1(t, x_-(t)) \geq C R_1(t, x_-(t))^2, \quad \text{for } t \geq T_0. \tag{5.6}$$

From $R(T_0, x_-(T_0)) > 0$, $R(t, x_-(t))$ is going to infinity in finite time, which is contradiction to $T^* = \infty$.

Since the first estimate in (5.5) holds on $[0, T^*)$, we have

$$\varlimsup_{t \nearrow T^*} \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^\infty} + \|\partial_x u(t)\|_{L^\infty} = \infty.$$

□

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my gratitude to Professor Keiichi Kato for many valuable comments and warm encouragement.

References

[1] S. Alinhac, "Blowup for nonlinear hyperbolic equations, progress in nonlinear differential equations and their applications," Birkhäuser Boston, (1995).

[2] W. F. Ames, R. J. Lohner, *Group properties of* $u_{tt} = [f(u)u_x]_x$, Int. J. Non-liner Mathematics **16** (1981), 439-447.

[3] F. John, "Nonlinear wave equations, formation of singularities," Amer. Math. Soc. Providence (1990).

[4] B. Ding, H. Yin, *On the blowup of classical solutions to the* 3*-D pressure-gradient systems,* J. differential equations **252** (2012), 3608-3629.

[5] R. T. Glassey, J. K. Hunter, Y. Zheng, *Singularities of a variational wave equation,* J. Differential Equations **129** (1996), 49-78.

[6] R. T. Glassey, J. K. Hunter, Y. Zheng, *Singularities and oscillations in a nonlinear variational wave equation. Singularities and oscillations,* (Minneapolis, MN, 1994/1995), IMA Vol. Math. Appl. **91** (1997), 37-60.

[7] T. J. R. Hughes, T. Kato, J. E. Marsden, Well-posed quasi-linear second-order hyperbolic systems with applications to nonlinear elastodynamics and general relativity, Arch Rat. Mech. Anal **63** (1977), 273-294.

[8] K. Kato, Y. Sugiyama, *Local existence and uniqueness theory for the second sound equation in one space dimension,* J. Hyperbolic Differential Equations **9** (2012), 177-193.

[9] K. Kato, Y. Sugiyama, Nonexistence of a global solution to second sound equation in one space dimension, Kyushu journal of mathematics **67**, (2013) 129-142.

[10] P. D. Lax, *The formation and decay of shock waves,* Amer. Math. Monthly **79** (1972), 227-241.

[11] Y. Sugiyama, *Global existence of solutions to some quasilinear wave equation in one space dimension,* Differential and Integral Equations, **26** (2013), 487-504.

[12] C. D. Sogge, "Lectures on non-linear wave equations. Second edition," International Press, Boston, MA, (2008).

[13] T. Kato, *The Cauchy problem for quasi-linear symmetric hyperbolic systems,* Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **58** (1975), 181-205.

[14] J. Li, I. Witt, H. Yin, *On the blowup and life span of smooth solutions to a class of 2-D nonlinear wave equations with small initial data,* arXiv:1110.0662v1.

[15] A. Majda, "Compressible fluid flow and systems of conservation laws in several space variables," Appl. Math. Sci. Springer, (1984).

[16] R. C. MacCamy, V. J. Mizel, *Existence and nonexistence in the large of solutions of quasilinear wave equations,* Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **25** (1967), 299-320.

[17] M. E. Taylor, "Pseudodifferential operators and nonlinear PDE," Birkhauser Boston, (1991).

[18] P. Zhang, Y. Zheng, *Rarefactive solutions to a nonlinear variational wave equation of liquid crystals,* Comm. Partial differential equations **26** (2001), 381-419.

[19] P. Zhang, Y. Zheng, *Singular and rarefactive solutions to a nonlinear variational wave equation,* Chinese Ann. Math. Ser. **B 22** (2001), 159-170.

[20] N. J. Zabusky, *Exact solution for the vibrations of a nonlinear continuous model string,* J. Math. Phys. **3** (1962), 1028-1039.